



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/800,093	03/05/2001	Geoffrey B. Rhoads	P0323	3258

23735 7590 07/28/2003

DIGIMARC CORPORATION
19801 SW 72ND AVENUE
SUITE 100
TUALATIN, OR 97062

EXAMINER

BLACKMAN, ANTHONY J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2676

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2003

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

10

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/800,093

Applicant(s)

RHOADS, GEOFFREY B.

Examiner

ANTHONY J BLACKMAN

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 May 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5 and 7. 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by NARAYANASWAMI et al, US Patent No. 6,504,571.

As per claim 1, NARAYANASWAMI et al teach in a method of compiling satellite imagery (column 3, lines 6-50, column 4, lines 24-40 [at least inherent satellite imagery], column 8, lines 40-47, column 9, lines 33-40, column 10, lines 48-61, column 11, line 12-column 12, line 22 [at least inherent satellite imagery]) and generating a map (figure 3, elements 322, 324, 326, column 3, lines 6-50, col. 1, line 58-col 2, line 6, 59-col 3, line 50, col 4, lines 7-12, 32-40, col 8, line 63-col 9, line 13, col 10, lines 6-34, col 11, line 45-col 12, lines 22, 66-col 13, lines 10 and 56-62)

4. As per claim 1, NARAYANASWAMI et al therefrom, an improvement comprising: watermarking image data (fig 1, elements 100 and 134, col 8, lines 6-21) acquired by a satellite (figure 3, elements 304, 306, 308, 312, 322, 324 and 326, col 2, line 59-col 3, line 50, col 4, line 14-41, col 10, line 48-61, col 11, line 12-col 12, line 22 [at least inherent satellite means]);

storing the watermarked image data in a database (figure 1, element 108, figure 2, elements 206, 208, 210, 212, 214, 216 218, figure 3, elements 304, 312, 322, col 8, lines 6-21, col 11, line 12-col 12, line 22); generating a map from the database (figure 3, elements 322, 324, 326, column 3, lines 6-50, col. 1, line 58-col 2, line 6, 59-col 3, line 50, col 4, lines 7-12, 32-40, col 8, line 63-col 9, line 13, col 10, lines 6-34, col 11, line 45-col 12, lines 22, 66-col 13, lines 10 and 56-62); and watermarking the map (it is inherent that as long as watermarking image data acquired by a satellite is performed that watermarking the map must also be performed , please see above).

5. As per claim 2, NARAYANASWAMI et al meet limitations of claim 1, including in a method of generating a digital map from a database containing data from a plurality of aerial sources (column 3, lines 6-50, column 4, lines 24-40 [at least inherent satellite imagery], column 8, lines 40-47, column 9, lines 33-40, column 10, lines 48-61, column 11, line 12-column 12, line 22 [at least inherent satellite imagery]), an improvement comprising watermarking the map (column 3, lines 6-50, column 4, lines 24-40 [at least inherent satellite imagery], column 8, lines 40-47, column 9, lines 33-40, column 10, lines 48-61, column 11, line 12-column 12, line 22 [at least inherent satellite imagery]).

Art Unit: 2676

5. 6. As per claim 3 NARAYANASWAMI et al meet limitations of claim 2 including in which the watermarking encodes, or points to, information that is also conveyed with said map in the form of header data (column 6, lines 49-54 and col 8, lines 6-21)
7. As per claim 4, NARAYANASWAMI et al meet limitations of claim 2, including in which the watermark permits later identification of the data sources used in generating the map (fig 1, elements 100 and 134, col 8, lines 6-21).
8. As per claim 5, NARAYANASWAMI et al meet limitations of claim 2, including in which the watermark comprises, or serves as a link to, an image identifier (the image identifier is equivalent to the parameters of col 8, lines 6-21).
9. As per claim 6, NARAYANASWAMI et al meet limitations of claim 2, including in which the watermark comprises, or links to, data identifying at least one of the following: component used in forming said digital map, the date of digital map creation, an identifier corresponding to a person who created the digital map, an identifier corresponding to a person to whom the digital map was provided (identification of the photographer- see.col 6, lines 5-30-the underlined claim limitation is at least read upon by said reference).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2676

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over NARAYANASWAMI et al, US Patent No. 6,504,571 in view of VAN WIE et al, US Patent No. 5,943,422.

12. As per claim 7, NARAYANASWAMI et al meet limitations of claim 2, including a map processing means (figure 3, elements 322, 324, 326, column 3, lines 6-50, col. 1, line 58-col 2, line 6, 59-col 3, line 50, col 4, lines 7-12, 32-40, col 8, line 63-col 9, line 13, col 10, lines 6-34, col 11, line 45-col 12, lines 22, 66-col 13, lines 10 and 56-62), however, does not expressly teach the following recited claim limitation regarding degradation corresponding to map processing in the following manner, in which the watermark is designed to be lost, or degrade predictably, when the map is processed in a particular manner. VAN WIE et al suggests that the watermark is designed to be lost, or degrade predictably, when the map is processed in a particular manner col 2, lines 13-15, col 15, lines 22-47 and col 21, lines 52-67). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the "Steganographic Techniques for Securely Delivering Electronic Digital Rights Management Control Information Over Insecure Communication Channels", in addition to "...provid[ing] compatibility with a Virtual Distribution Environment "(abstract, lines 11-12), in addition to electronically encoding contents in an image (figure 2) of VAN WIE et al with the system and methods for querying digital image archives containing digital photographs and/or videos ...indexed in accordance with a plurality of recorded parameters including time, date and geographic , location data... (abstract, lines 1-5), in addition to satellite imagery

Art Unit: 2676

means (column 3, lines 6-50, column 4, lines 24-40 [at least inherent satellite imagery], column 8, lines 40-47, column 9, lines 33-40, column 10, lines 48-61, column 11, line 12-column 12, line 22 [at least inherent satellite imagery]) associated with watermarking processing (figure 1, element 134) and an image archive system (figure 2, col 4, lines 53-60) of NARAYANASWAMI et al because both inventions share similar technological environments related to the processing of data hiding techniques.

13. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over NARAYANASWAMI et al, US Patent No. 6,504,571 in view of REED et al, US Patent No. 6,590,996

14. As per claim 8, NARAYANASWAMI et al disclose the means of a composite map formed from plural sets of component map data (figure 3, elements 322, 324, 326, column 3, lines 6-50, col. 1, line 58-col 2, line 6, 59-col 3, line 50, col 4, lines 7-12, 32-40, col 8, line 63-col 9, line 13, col 10, lines 6-34, col 11, line 45-col 12, lines 22, 66-col 13, lines 10 and 56-62), in addition to the means of watermarks encoding, or linking to meta data associated with its respective component map data (col 9, lines 33-40, col 10, lines 48-59, col 11, line 12-col 12, line 22), however, does not expressly teach that the means of a composite map formed from plural sets of component map data are each encoded with a different watermark, each of said different watermarks encoding, or linking to meta data associated with its respective component map data. REED et al provides the suggestion that the means of a composite map formed from plural sets of component map data are each encoded with a different watermark, each of said

Art Unit: 2676

different watermarks encoding, or linking to meta data associated with its respective component map data (col 5, line 66-col 6, line 33, col 7, lines 26-37). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the variable watermarking means of REED et al with the system and methods for querying digital image archives containing digital photographs and/or videos ...indexed in accordance with a plurality of recorded parameters including time, date and geographic, location data... (abstract, lines 1-5), in addition to satellite imagery means (column 3, lines 6-50, column 4, lines 24-40 [at least inherent satellite imagery], column 8, lines 40-47, column 9, lines 33-40, column 10, lines 48-61, column 11, line 12-column 12, line 22 [at least inherent satellite imagery]) associated with watermarking processing (figure 1, element 134) and an image archive system (figure 2, col 4, lines 53-60) of NARAYANASWAMI et al because both inventions share similar technological environments related to the processing of watermarking signals.

Conclusion

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY J BLACKMAN whose telephone number is 703-305-0833. The examiner can normally be reached on FLEX SCHEDULE.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MATTHEW BELLA can be reached on 703-308-6829. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-

Application/Control Number: 09/800,093

Page 8

Art Unit: 2676


872-9314 for regular communications and 703-746-5731 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



ANTHONY J BLACKMAN
Examiner
Art Unit 2676

July 22, 2003



MATTHEW C. BELLA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600